

Ms Pelkey, Mr Wigfield, Mr Litman;

.  
After noticing your email addresses listed at the top of [DOC-348151a1.pdf](#) and other FCC releases, I, Curtis J Neeley Jr, wish to communicate to the commission through Ms Tina Pelkey, Mr. Mark Wigfield, and Mr. Travis Litman.

.  
. . . . Chairman Pai will very soon proceed with foisting the ([347927A1](#)) proposal on the public and attempt to convince the public this return to a "light-touch" approach is a return to a better type regulation, which encourages investment and innovation.

.  
. . . . *Reno v ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844 has been VOID since 2000 or before when wire and radio communications merged. The *Reno v ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844 Article III mistake destroyed U.S. morals due to allowing unlimited, unregulated consumption of illegal free speech being broadcast by wire and radio after these two mediums merged and were called a new medium entitled to unlimited, unregulated free speech despite being counter to the rule of law.

.  
. . . . There was NEVER a "*unique and wholly new medium for worldwide human communications*" nor were there ever an "airwaves" medium created by *Pacifica*, 1978. The elderly U.S. Courts were and are still unable to honorably resolve litigation involving the 'N-ternet' due to having no formative life experiences with merged wire and radio communications.

.  
. . . . There will not be an Article III judge with formative life experiences ( from age 13) with merged wire and radio communications until around 2045 if another 32-year-old Associate Justice were to be appointed. With the youngest Associate Justice being at age 50 today, this is highly unlikely. This should highlight the improbability of hoping SCOTUS will honorably resolve regulation of merged wire and radio communications.

.  
. . . . Perhaps none of you are aware of *Neeley Jr v 5 Federal Communications Commissioners, et al.* This federal case was dismissed after wire/radio communications were altered partially as demanded therein on February 26, 2015 by the FCC, GOOG, and MSFT. Chairman Pai and the entire FCC does NOT have the ability to repeal Title II because this law was passed by Congress.

.  
. . . . Chairman Pai, et. al. will revise FCC policy ONLY and assert the common carrier of wire/radio communications (disguised as N-ternet) is something other than the Title II telecommunications these have always been. This use of legal jargon instead of fact will not be allowed to continue. Everyone has apparently forgotten the wires, which allow N-ternet to exist, are built on and across public properties and must therefore be governed in the interests of the best public interests whether these public interests motivate private investment and innovation or do not.

. . . . ISPs are always natural monopolies or oligarchies just as electric and water utilities. The market principles Chairman Pai claims will protect consumer's use of wire/radio broadband do not exist anywhere besides within Chairman Pai's imagination. This will soon harm most U.S. citizens and will be counter to the public interests and motivate a Second Circuit Court of Appeals Petition to be Reconsidered and set aside.

. . . . Curtis J. Neeley Jr. has a personal interest and standing in reconsideration of the proposal because recognizing the common carrier these merged mediums have always been was demanded in [Neeley Jr v 5 Federal Communications Commissioners, et al.](#) before the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. United States Courts are addicted to free anonymous access to porn or are predisposed to treat *Reno v ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844 as if this CLEAR mistake has not been VOID since 2000 or before.

. . . . Curtis J. Neeley Jr. will not again pursue GOOG and MSFT because these organized pornography broadcasting criminals continue to mitigate the damages done to Curtis J. Neeley Jr. as demanded in [Neeley Jr v 5 Federal Communications Commissioners, et al.](#)

The 3 commissioners who support the ([347927A1](#)) proposal are harming the rights of Curtis J. Neeley Jr., GOOG, MSFT, FB, Netflix, and billions of individual citizens.

. . . . You are each advised to please notify Chairman Pai, Commissioner O'Reiley, and Commissioner Carr; -passage of the ([347927A1](#)) proposal is obviously NOT in the best public interests and will therefore be challenged in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals as well as before SCOTUS originally due to the exceptional impact of this case. This is NOT a threat and will be filed as a NOTICE in the 17-108 proceeding.

.  
.  
--  
Sincerely,  
Curtis Neeley Jr  
14792634795 t-sms  
15014217083 f